

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated January 9, 2004 has been received, its contents carefully noted, and the applied citations thoroughly studied. Accordingly, the foregoing revisions to the specification and claims are tendered with the conviction that patentable contrast has now been made manifest over the known prior art. Accordingly, all rejections tendered by the Examiner in the above-referenced Office Action are hereby respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

At the outset, undersigned wishes to gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's perception of patentable subject matter as it pertains to claims 13 through 16 and 21 through 23.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

With respect to the rejection of claims 17 through 20 and 24 through 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the rejection was addressed in the Amendment filed May 19, 2003, at page 10, lines 19-20: "The Examiner could not locate the concept of an integer multiplier or fraction divider in the text. These examples are found bridging pages 12 and 13."

Specifically, the cited portion of the original specification gives examples of segment markings, for example: "collect", in which the face value of the odometer

(counter) is awarded (or is multiplied by an integer of one); "collect/double", in which the face value is multiplied by an integer, "collect/half", in which the face value is multiplied by a fraction, and number markings, which award an unrelated amount. These examples are sufficient to support "means to bestow either said face value, a multiplier of said face value or an unrelated amount", as required by claim 17. In claim 18, the multiplier is an integer (e.g., "collect/double"); in claim 19, the multiplier is an integer (e.g., "collect/half"); and in claim 23, the multiplier is either an integer or a fraction. Claims 25 and 26, respectively, are specific as to the identity of the integer (e.g., the integer 2, which doubles the face value) and the fraction (e.g., the fraction 1/2, which halves the face value).

The Examiner has rejected claim 20 as being dependent on the rejected base claim. The Examiner has provided no reference to encompass the structure added in claim 20, i.e., "said further award includes a wheel larger than said N wheels and disposed above said N wheels, said N wheels disposed above said N reels in substantial vertical alignment", and has not cited any of this claim in the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 112. Clarification by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have further questions regarding this issue, a Request for Personal Interview is enclosed, such that resolution may be made in an efficient manner.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner pass this case to issue. If, upon further consideration, the Examiner believes further issues remain outstanding or new ones have been generated, undersigned respectfully requests that the Examiner call undersigned to expeditiously resolve same.

Dated: July 9, 2004

Respectfully Submitted:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bernhard Kreten', is written over a horizontal line.

BERNHARD KRETEN  
Applicant's Attorney  
Telephone (916) 930-9700  
Registration No.: 27,037